JUL 27 2016

LOS ANGELES WATERKEEPER®

July 22, 2016

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

Allan Company
Attn: Managing Agent
2411 Delaware Street
Santa Monica, California 90404

Allan Company
14618 Arrow Highway
Baldwin Park, California 91706

Stephen A. Young
Registered Agent for Service of Process for
Allan Company
14620 Joanbridge Street
Baldwin Park, California 91706

Re: Notice of Violation and Intent to File Suit Under the Clean Water Act

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing on behalf of Los Angeles Waterkeeper ("Waterkeeper") regarding violations of the Clean Water Act[1] and California's Industrial Storm Water Permit[2] ("Storm Water Permit") occurring at the industrial facility with its main address at: 2411 Delaware Street, Santa Monica, California 90404 ("Facility"). The purpose of this letter is to put Allan Company ("Allan Co."), as the owner and/or operator of the Facility, on notice of the violations of the Storm Water Permit occurring at the Facility, including, but not limited to, discharges of polluted storm water from the Facility into local surface waters. Violations of the Storm Water Permit are violations of the Clean Water Act. As explained below, Allan Co. is liable for violations of the Storm Water Permit and the Clean Water Act.

Section 505(b) of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1365(b), requires that sixty (60) days prior to the initiation of a civil action under Section 505(a) of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1365(a), a citizen must give notice of his/her intention to file suit. The Clean Water Act requires that notice must be given to the alleged violator, the Administrator of the United States Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA"), the Regional Administrator of the EPA, the Executive Officer of the water pollution control agency in the State in which the violations

---

[1] Federal Water Pollution Control Act, 33 U.S.C. §§ 1251 *et seq.*

[2] National Pollution Discharge Elimination System ("NPDES") General Permit No. CAS000001, Water Quality Order No. 92-12-DWQ, Order No. 97-03-DWQ, as amended by Order No. 2014-0057-DWQ. Between 1997 and June 30, 2015, the Storm Water Permit in effect was Order No. 97-03-DWQ, which Waterkeeper refers to as the "1997 Permit." On July 1, 2015, pursuant to Order No. 2014-0057-DWQ the Storm Water Permit was reissued. For purposes of this Notice Letter, Waterkeeper refers to this reissuance of the Storm Water Permit as the "2015 Permit."

occur, and, if the alleged violator is a corporation, the registered agent of the corporation. *See* 40 C.F.R. § 135.2(a)(1).

This letter is being sent to you as the responsible owner and operator of the Facility, or as the registered agent for this entity. This notice letter ("Notice Letter") is issued pursuant to 33 U.S.C. §§ 1365(a) and (b) of the Clean Water Act to inform Allan Co. that Waterkeeper intends to file a federal enforcement action against Allan Co. for violations of the Storm Water Permit and the Clean Water Act sixty (60) days from the date of this Notice Letter.

I. BACKGROUND

A. Los Angeles Waterkeeper.

Los Angeles Waterkeeper is a non-profit 501(c)(3) public benefit corporation organized under the laws of California with its main office at 120 Broadway, Suite 105, Santa Monica, California 90401. Founded in 1993, Waterkeeper has approximately 3,000 members who live and/or recreate in and around the Los Angeles area. Waterkeeper is dedicated to the preservation, protection, and defense of the inland and coastal surface and groundwaters of Los Angeles County (including Ballona Creek) from all sources of pollution and degradation. To further this mission, Waterkeeper actively seeks federal and state implementation of the Clean Water Act. Where necessary, Waterkeeper directly initiates enforcement actions on behalf of itself and its members.

Members of Waterkeeper reside in Los Angeles County, and near Santa Monica Bay and the Pacific Ocean (hereinafter "Receiving Waters"). As explained in detail below, Allan Co. continuously discharges pollutants into the Receiving Waters, in violation of the Clean Water Act and the Storm Water Permit. Waterkeeper members use the Receiving Waters to swim, boat, kayak, bird watch, view wildlife, hike, bike, walk, and run. Additionally, Waterkeeper members use the waters to engage in scientific study through pollution and habitat monitoring and restoration activities. The unlawful discharge of pollutants from the Facility into the Receiving Waters impairs Waterkeeper members' use and enjoyment of these waters. Thus, the interests of Waterkeeper's members have been, are being, and will continue to be adversely affected by Allan Co.'s failure to comply with the Clean Water Act and the Storm Water Permit.

B. The Owner and Operator of the Facility.

Information available to Waterkeeper indicates that Allan Co. is the owner and operator of the Facility. Allan Co. is an active California corporation and its registered agent is: Stephen A. Young, 14620 Joanbridge Street, Baldwin Park, California 91706.

C. The Facility's Storm Water Permit Coverage.

Facilities that discharge storm water associated with specified industrial activities are required to apply for coverage under the Storm Water Permit by submitting a Notice of Intent ("NOI") to the State Water Resources Control Board ("State Board") to obtain Storm Water

Permit coverage.

Information available to Waterkeeper indicates that Allan Co. first obtained coverage for the Facility under the Storm Water Permit on January 22, 1996. Allan Co. filed an NOI to continue its coverage of the 1997 Permit on May 21, 1997 ("1997 NOI"). On June 30, 2015, Allan Co. submitted an NOI to continue the Facility's coverage under the reissued Storm Water Permit ("2015 NOI"). Allan Co. also submitted a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan ("SWPPP") dated "June 2015" (hereinafter referred to as "2015 SWPPP"). The 2015 SWPPP states it was revised on June 29, 2015 to address requirements of the 2015 Permit. The 2015 SWPPP was also revised February 22, 2016.

The 1997 NOI identifies the owner of the Facility as "Allan Company" and the 2015 NOI identifies the owner of the Facility as "Allan Co.". The 1997 NOI identifies the Facility name and location as "Allan Company, 2411 Delaware Ave, Santa Monica, CA 90404." The 2015 NOI identifies the Facility name and location as "Allan Co, 2411 Delaware Ave 14620 Joanbridge St., Santa Monica, CA 90404." The 2015 NOI lists the Facility as "1 acre" and lists the industrial area exposed to storm water as 18,250 square feet. The 2015 SWPPP states the facility covers 1.472 acres and Ehe 2015 NOI lists the Waste Discharge Identification ("WDID") number for the Facility as 4 19I012110. The 1997 NOI and the 2015 NOI identifies the Standard Industrial Classification ("SIC") code for the Facility as 5093 (Scrap and Waste Material). The 1997 and 2015 NOIs list the "Receiving Water" as the Pacific Ocean.

D. Storm Water Pollution.

With every significant rainfall event millions of gallons of polluted storm water originating from industrial operations such as the Facility discharge into storm drains and local waterways. The consensus among agencies and water quality specialists is that storm water pollution accounts for more than half of the total pollution entering surface waters each year. Such discharges of pollutants from industrial facilities contribute to the impairment of downstream waters and aquatic dependent wildlife. These contaminated discharges can and must be controlled for the ecosystem to regain its health.

Although pollution and habitat destruction have drastically diminished once-abundant and varied fisheries, these waters are still essential habitat for dozens of fish and bird species as well as macro-invertebrate and invertebrate species. Storm water and non-storm water contaminated with sediment, heavy metals, and other pollutants harm the special aesthetic and recreational significance that surface waters have for people in local communities. The public's use of local waterways exposes many people to toxic metals and other contaminants in storm water discharges. Non-contact recreational and aesthetic opportunities, such as wildlife observation, are also impaired by polluted discharges to local waterways.

Based on EPA's Industrial Storm Water Fact Sheet for Sector N: Scrap Recycling and Waste Recycling Facilities, polluted discharges from industrial activities like those conducted at the Facility contain pH affecting substances; metals, such as iron and aluminum; toxic metals, such as lead, zinc, cadmium, chromium, copper, arsenic, cyanide, and mercury; toxic organic

pollutants;; biological oxygen demand ("BOD"); total suspended solids ("TSS")[3]; benzene, fuel additives, gasoline, oil and grease ("O&G"), antifreeze and diesel fuels; coolants and solvents; and, trash and debris. Many of these pollutants are on the list of chemicals published by the State of California as known to cause cancer, birth defects, and/or developmental or reproductive harm. Discharges of polluted storm water to the Receiving Waters pose carcinogenic and reproductive toxicity threats to the public and adversely affect the aquatic environment.

II. THE FACILITY AND ASSOCIATED DISCHARGES OF POLLUTANTS

A. The Facility Site Description and Industrial Activities.

The Facility is located at 2411 Delaware Avenue in Santa Monica, California. It is bordered on the south by and surrounded by private property on the east, west and north. Information available to Waterkeeper indicates that the Facility is approximately 1.4 acres in size and is engaged primarily in buying back and recycling plastic, glass, paper, aluminum cans, non-ferrous metal, and electronic waste from the public. *See* 2015 SWPPP, §§ 3.0 and 4.1. Materials come on site and are sorted and processed. The waste materials that are received at the Facility are stored there until they are shipped off site for processing or disposal. *See id.* Information available to Waterkeeper indicates that the Facility is 100% impervious surface. *See id.* at § 4.4.

The industrial activities and areas at the Facility include but are not limited to the buyback receiving area, sorting area, the baler and baler area, loading and unloading areas, waste storage areas, customer parking area, employee parking area, and machinery and equipment maintenance. *See* 2015 SWPPP at §§ 4.1-4.3. There is also a truck scale, open and uncovered storage bins, and a used oil tank. *See* Facility Site Map. These activities and areas are all significant pollutant sources at the Facility.

B. Facility Pollutants and BMPs.

The pollutants associated with operations at the Facility include, but are not limited to: pH-affecting substances; metals, such as iron, aluminum, lead, zinc, cadmium, chromium, copper, arsenic, and mercury; BOD; TSS; benzene; gasoline and diesel fuels; fuel additives; coolants; antifreeze; O&G; and trash and debris.

Information available to Waterkeeper indicates Allan Co. has not properly developed and/or implemented the necessary best management practices ("BMPs") to address pollutant

[3] High concentrations of TSS degrade optical water quality by reducing water clarity and decreasing light available to support photosynthesis. TSS has been shown to alter predator prey relationships (for example, turbid water may make it difficult for fish to hunt prey). Deposited solids alter fish habitat, aquatic plants, and benthic organisms. TSS can also be harmful to aquatic life because numerous pollutants, including metals and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, are absorbed onto TSS. Inorganic sediments, including settleable matter and suspended solids, have been shown to negatively impact species richness, diversity, and total biomass of filter feeding aquatic organisms on bottom surfaces.

sources and contaminated discharges. BMPs are necessary at the Facility to prevent the exposure of pollutants to precipitation and the subsequent discharge of polluted storm water from the Facility. Due to the lack of BMPs and/or the inadequacy of the BMPs used at the Facility, industrial activities and pollutants are exposed to precipitation during rain events, and this polluted storm water discharges to the storm drain system, which discharges into the Receiving Waters. For example, the majority of the BMPs listed for the numerous toxic pollutants present at the Facility include only general good housekeeping measures such as inspections and sweeping. *See* 2015 SWPPP, § 6.

The 2015 SWPPP is also deficient as it fails to provide sufficient guidance regarding the timing and scope of housekeeping BMPs at the site, or address the importance of ensuring housekeeping measures are taken prior to predicted rain events to minimize pollutant exposure to storm water.

Finally, the 2015 Permit establishes numeric action levels ("NALs"), which are pollutant levels in discharges that, if exceeded, indicate that a facility's BMPs are inadequately developed or implemented, or both, and must be improved. 2015 Permit, Fact Sheet at 55-60. The sampling results from discharges from the Allan Co. exceed the NALs for aluminum, copper, zinc, iron, and COD. These exceedances are further evidence demonstrating that Allan Co. has and continues to fail to develop, implement and/or maintain BMPs to reduce pollutant levels in storm water discharges as required by the Storm Water Permit, and that Allan Co. has not developed or implemented, or revised, a SWPPP as required by the Storm Water Permit.

C. Facility Storm Water Flows and Discharge Locations.

Information available to Waterkeeper indicates that storm water at the Facility discharges into the storm drain system, which drains directly to Santa Monica Bay via the Kenter Canyon Drain. The 2015 SWPPP identifies four discharge locations at the Facility as follows:

> Outfall one is in the Southeast corner and collects storm water from the loading dock and bale storage area of the facility. Outfall two is in the South/center of the facility and collects storm water from the truck scale and office portion of the facility. Outfall three is in the Southwest portion of the facility and collects storm water from the customer parking/buyback center portion of the facility. Outfall four is in the Northwest corner of the facility and collects storm water from the employee parking portion of the facility.

See 2015 SWPPP, § 3.1. Each outfall is a designated storm water sample location for the Facility.

The Regional Board issued the *Water Quality Control Plan for the Coastal Watersheds of Los Angeles and Ventura County* ("Basin Plan"). The Basin Plan identifies the "Beneficial Uses" of the Receiving Waters that receive polluted storm water discharges from the Facility. These Beneficial Uses include: navigation (NAV), commercial and sportfishing (COMM), marine habitat (MAR), migration (MIGR), spawning, reproduction and early development (SPWN),

wildlife habitat (WILD), shellfish harvesting (SHELL), water contact recreation (REC 1), and non-contact water recreation (REC 2). *See* Basin Plan, Tables 2-1a and 2-3. According to the 2012 303(d) List of Impaired Water Bodies, Santa Monica Bay is listed as impaired for the pollutant category DDT, debris, PCBs, and sediment toxicity.[4] The 2015 SWPPP identifies 2019 as the completion date for TMDLs for Santa Monica Bay. *Id.* Polluted discharges from the Facility cause and/or contribute to the degradation of this already impaired surface water and aquatic dependent wildlife. For the aquatic ecosystem to regain its health, contaminated storm water discharges, including those from the Facility, must be eliminated.

III. VIOLATIONS OF THE CLEAN WATER ACT AND THE STORM WATER PERMIT

In California, any person who discharges storm water associated with industrial activity must comply with the terms of the Storm Water Permit in order to lawfully discharge pollutants. *See* 33 U.S.C. §§ 1311(a), 1342; 40 C.F.R. § 122.26(c)(1).

The 2015 Permit superseded the 1997 Permit, except for enforcement purposes, and its terms are as stringent, or more stringent, than the terms of the 1997 Permit. *See* 2015 Permit, Findings, ¶ 6. Accordingly, Allan Co. is liable for violations of the 1997 Permit and ongoing violations of the 2015 Permit, and civil penalties and injunctive relief are available remedies. *See Illinois v. Outboard Marine, Inc.*, 680 F.2d 473, 480-81 (7th Cir. 1982) (relief granted for violations of an expired permit); *Sierra Club v. Aluminum Co. of Am.*, 585 F. Supp. 842, 853-54 (N.D.N.Y. 1984) (holding that the Clean Water Act's legislative intent and public policy favor allowing penalties for violations of an expired permit); *Pub. Interest Research Group of N.J. v. Carter-Wallace, Inc.*, 684 F. Supp. 115, 121-22 (D.N.J. 1988) ("Limitations of an expired permit, when those limitations have been transferred unchanged to the newly issued permit, may be viewed as currently in effect").

A. Discharges of Polluted Storm Water in Violation of the Storm Water Permit's Requirement to Develop and Implement BMPs That Achieve BAT/BCT.

Effluent Limitation B(3) of the 1997 Permit requires dischargers to reduce or prevent pollutants associated with industrial activity in storm water discharges through implementation of BMPs that achieve Best Available Technology Economically Achievable ("BAT") for toxic[5] and non-conventional pollutants and Best Conventional Pollutant Control Technology ("BCT") for conventional pollutants.[6] The 2015 Permit includes the same effluent limitation. *See* 2015 Permit, Effluent Limitation V.A.

---

[4] 2012 Integrated Report – All Assessed Waters, available at: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/tmdl/integrated2012.shtml (last accessed on July 19, 2016).

[5] Toxic pollutants are listed at 40 C.F.R. § 401.15 and include copper, lead, and zinc, among others.

[6] Conventional pollutants are listed at 40 C.F.R. § 401.16 and include biochemical oxygen demand, TSS, oil and grease, pH, and fecal coliform.

As discussed above, information available to Waterkeeper indicates that BMPs that achieve BAT/BCT have not been developed and/or implemented at the Facility. The analytical results of storm water sampling at the Facility demonstrates that Allan Co. has failed and continues to fail to develop and/or implement BMPs that achieve BAT/BCT. EPA Benchmarks are relevant and objective standards for evaluating whether a permittee's BMPs achieve compliance with BAT/BCT standards as required by Effluent Limitation B(3) of the 1997 Permit and Effluent Limitation V.A. of the 2015 Permit.[7] For example, samples collected by Allan Co. document that storm water containing levels of aluminum, iron, copper, zinc, and COD well above EPA's Benchmark Levels is discharged from the Facility. *See* Exhibit 1 attached hereto which sets out a table with the results of sampling at the Facility conducted by Allan Co. compared to EPA Benchmark Levels. Information available to Waterkeeper including the significant exceedances of EPA Benchmarks demonstrates that Allan Co. has failed and continues to fail to develop and/or implement BMPs at the Facility to achieve compliance with the BAT/BCT standards.

Waterkeeper puts Allan Co. on notice that the Storm Water Permit Effluent Limitations are violated each time storm water discharges from the Facility. *See, e.g.*, Exhibit 2 (setting forth dates of significant rain events).[8] These discharge violations are ongoing and will continue every time Allan Co. discharges polluted storm water without developing and/or implementing BMPs that achieve compliance with the BAT/BCT standards. Waterkeeper will update the dates of violations when additional information and data become available. Each time Allan Co. discharges polluted storm water in violation of Effluent Limitation B(3) of the 1997 Permit and Effluent Limitation V.A. of the 2015 Permit is a separate and distinct violation of the Storm Water Permit and Section 301(a) of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1311(a). Allan Co. is subject to civil penalties for all violations of the Clean Water Act occurring since July 22, 2011.

Further, Waterkeeper puts Allan Co. on notice that 2015 Permit Effluent Limitation V.A. is a separate, independent requirement with which Allan Co. must comply, and that carrying out the iterative process triggered by exceedances of the NALs listed at Table 2 of the 2015 Permit does not amount to compliance with the Permit's Effluent Limitations. While exceedances of the NALs demonstrate that a facility is among the worst performing facilities in the State, the NALs do not represent technology based criteria relevant to determining whether an industrial facility

---

[7] *See United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Multi-Sector General Permit for Stormwater Discharges Associated with Industrial Activity (MSGP) Authorization to Discharge Under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System*, as modified effective February 26, 2009 ("Multi-Sector Permit"), Fact Sheet at 106; *see also*, 65 Federal Register 64839 (2000).

[8] Dates of significant rain events are measured at the Los Angeles/USC Rain Gauge operated by the National Weather Service. A significant rain event is defined by EPA as a rainfall event generating 0.1 inches or more of rainfall, which generally results in discharges at a typical industrial facility.

has implemented BMPs that achieve BAT/BCT.[9] Finally, even if Allan Co. submits an Exceedance Response Action Plan(s) pursuant to Section XII. of the 2015 Permit, the violations of Effluent Limitation V.A. described in this Notice Letter are ongoing.

B. <u>Discharges of Polluted Storm Water from the Facility in Violation of Storm Water Permit Receiving Water Limitations.</u>

Receiving Water Limitation C(2) of the 1997 Permit prohibits storm water discharges and authorized non-storm water discharges that cause or contribute to an exceedance of an applicable Water Quality Standard ("WQS").[10] The 2015 Permit includes the same receiving water limitation. *See* 2015 Permit, Receiving Water Limitation VI.A. Discharges that contain pollutants in excess of an applicable WQS violate the Storm Water Permit Receiving Water Limitations. *See* 1997 Permit, Receiving Water Limitation C(2); 2015 Permit, Receiving Water Limitation VI.A.

Receiving Water Limitation C(1) of the 1997 Permit prohibits storm water discharges and authorized non-storm water discharges to surface water that adversely impact human health or the environment. The 2015 Permit includes the same Receiving Water Limitation. *See* 2015 Permit, Receiving Water Limitation VI.B. Discharges that contain pollutants in concentrations that exceed levels known to adversely impact aquatic species and the environment constitute violations of the Storm Water Permit's Receiving Water Limitations. *See* 1997 Permit, Receiving Water Limitation C(1); 2015 Permit, Receiving Water Limitation VI.B.

Storm water sampling at the Facility demonstrates that discharges contain concentrations of pollutants that cause or contribute to a violation of an applicable WQS. *See* Exhibit 1, table of sampling data compared to WQSs. Although Allan Co. fails to analyze its samples for all pollutants associated with its industrial activity, storm water samples for pollutants it does sample for are in excess of applicable WQS. These exceedances of WQS demonstrate that Allan Co. has violated and continues to violate the Storm Water Permit Receiving Water Limitations. *See* 1997 Permit, Receiving Water Limitation C(2); 2015 Permit, Receiving Water Limitation VI.A.

---

[9] "The NALs are not intended to serve as technology-based or water quality-based numeric effluent limitations. The NALs are not derived directly from either BAT/BCT requirements or receiving water objectives. NAL exceedances defined in [the 2015] Permit are not, in and of themselves, violations of [the 2015] Permit." 2015 Permit, Finding 63, p. 11. The NALs do, however, trigger reporting requirements. *See* 2015 Permit, Section XII.

[10] Water quality standards are pollutant concentration levels determined by the state or federal agencies to be protective of designated Beneficial Uses. Discharges above water quality standards contribute to impairment of Receiving Waters' Beneficial Uses. Applicable water quality standards include, among others, the Criteria for Priority Toxic Pollutants in the State of California, 40 C.F.R. § 131.38 ("CTR"), and water quality objectives in the Basin Plan. Industrial storm water discharges must strictly comply with water quality standards, including those criteria listed in the applicable water quality plans. *See Defenders of Wildlife v. Browner*, 191 F.3d 1159, 1166-67 (9th Cir. 1999).

Discharges of elevated concentrations of pollutants in the storm water from the Facility adversely impact human health. These harmful discharges from the Facility are violations of the Storm Water Permit Receiving Water Limitations. *See* 1997 Permit, Receiving Water Limitation C(1); 2015 Permit, Receiving Water Limitation VI.B.

Waterkeeper puts Allan Co. on notice that Storm Water Permit Receiving Water Limitations are violated each time polluted storm water discharges from the Facility. *See, e.g.*, Exhibit 1. These discharge violations are ongoing and will continue every time contaminated storm water is discharged in violation of the Storm Water Permit Receiving Water Limitations. Each time discharges of storm water from the Facility cause or contribute to a violation of an applicable WQS is a separate and distinct violation of Receiving Water Limitation C(2) of the 1997 Permit, Receiving Water Limitation VI.A. of the 2015 Permit VI.A, and Section 301(a) of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1311(a). Each time discharges from the Facility adversely impact human health or the environment is a separate and distinct violation of Receiving Water Limitation C(1) of the 1997 Permit, Receiving Water Limitation VI.B. of the 2015 Permit, and Section 301(a) of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1311(a). Waterkeeper will update the dates of violation when additional information and data becomes available. Allan Co. is subject to civil penalties for all violations of the Clean Water Act occurring since July 22, 2011.

Further, Waterkeeper puts Allan Co. on notice that 2015 Permit Receiving Water Limitations are separate, independent requirements with which Allan Co. must comply, and that carrying out the iterative process triggered by exceedances of the NALs listed at Table 2 of the 2015 Permit does not amount to compliance with the Receiving Water Limitations. While exceedances of the NALs demonstrate that a facility is among the worst performing facilities in the State, the NALs do not represent water quality based criteria relevant to determining whether an industrial facility has caused or contributed to an exceedance of a water quality standard.[11] Finally, even if Allan Co. submits an Exceedance Response Action Plan(s) pursuant to Section XII. of the 2015 Permit, the violations of the Receiving Water Limitations described in this Notice Letter are ongoing.

C. Failure to Develop, Implement, and/or Revise an Adequate Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan.

The Storm Water Permit requires permittees to develop and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan prior to conducting, and in order to continue, industrial activities. The specific SWPPP requirements of the 1997 Permit and the 2015 Permit are set out below.

1. 1997 SWPPP Requirements.

[11] "The NALs are not intended to serve as technology-based or water quality-based numeric effluent limitations. The NALs are not derived directly from either BAT/BCT requirements or receiving water objectives. NAL exceedances defined in [the 2015] Permit are not, in and of themselves, violations of [the 2015] Permit." 2015 Permit, Finding 63, p. 11. Exceedances of the NALs do, however, trigger reporting requirements. *See* 2015 Permit, Section XII.

Section A(1) and Provision E(2) of the 1997 Permit require dischargers to have developed and implemented a SWPPP by October 1, 1992, or prior to beginning industrial activities, that meets all of the requirements of the Storm Water Permit. The objectives of the 1997 Permit SWPPP requirement are to identify and evaluate sources of pollutants associated with industrial activities that may affect the quality of storm water discharges from the Facility, and to implement site-specific BMPs to reduce or prevent pollutants associated with industrial activities in storm water discharges. *See* 1997 Permit, Section A(2). These BMPs must achieve compliance with the Storm Water Permit's Effluent Limitations and Receiving Water Limitations.

To ensure compliance with the Storm Water Permit, the SWPPP must be evaluated on an annual basis pursuant to the requirements of Section A(9) of the 1997 Permit, and must be revised as necessary to ensure compliance with the Storm Water Permit. 1997 Permit, Sections A(9) and (10). Sections A(3) – A(10) of the 1997 Permit set forth the requirements for a SWPPP. Among other requirements, the SWPPP must include: a site map showing the facility boundaries, storm water drainage areas with flow patterns, nearby water bodies, the location of the storm water collection, conveyance and discharge system, structural control measures, areas of actual and potential pollutant contact, areas of industrial activity, and other features of the facility and its industrial activities (*see* 1997 Permit, Section A(4)); a list of significant materials handled and stored at the site (*see* 1997 Permit, Section A(5)); a description of potential pollutant sources, including industrial processes, material handling and storage areas, dust and particulate generating activities, significant spills and leaks, non-storm water discharges and their sources, and locations where soil erosion may occur (*see* 1997 Permit, Section A(6)).

Sections A(7) and A(8) of the 1997 Permit require an assessment of potential pollutant sources at the facility and a description of the BMPs to be implemented at the facility that will reduce or prevent pollutants in storm water discharges and authorized non-storm water discharges, including structural BMPs where non-structural BMPs are not effective.

2. 2015 SWPPP Requirements.

As with the SWPPP requirements of the 1997 Permit, Sections X(A) - (H) of the 2015 Permit require dischargers to have developed and implemented a SWPPP that meets all of the requirements of the 2015 Permit. *See also* 2015 Permit, Appendix 1. The objective of the SWPPP requirements are still to identify and evaluate sources of pollutants associated with industrial activities that may affect the quality of storm water discharges, and to implement site-specific BMPs to reduce or prevent pollutants associated with industrial activities in storm water discharges. *See* 2015 Permit, Section X(C).

The SWPPP must include, among other things and consistent with the 1997 Permit, a narrative description and summary of all industrial activity, potential sources of pollutants, and potential pollutants; a site map indicating the storm water conveyance system, associated points of discharge, direction of flow, identification of areas of soil erosion and impervious areas, areas of actual and potential pollutant contact, including the extent of pollution-generating activities,

nearby water bodies, and pollutants control measures. *See* 2015 Permit, Section X(A)-(H). The SWPPP must also contain a description of the BMPs developed and implemented to reduce or prevent pollutants in storm water discharges and authorized non-storm water discharges necessary to comply with the Storm Water Permit; the identification and elimination of non-storm water discharges; the location where significant materials are being shipped, stored, received, and handled, as well as the typical quantities of such materials and the frequency with which they are handled; a description of dust and particulate-generating activities, and; the identification of individuals and their current responsibilities for developing and implementing the SWPPP. *Id.*

Further, permittees must establish individuals who will implement the requirements of the permit including conducting the required visual observations, collection of storm water samples, and otherwise preparing for storm events as set forth in each facility SWPPP. *See* 2015 Permit, Section X(D)(1). For example, the SWPPP must include the identity and position of individuals who will carry out the permit requirements, including specifically the responsibilities, duties, activities each member is in charge of. *Id.* The SWPPP must also contain "procedures to identify alternate team members to implement the SWPPP and conduct required monitoring when the regularly assigned team members are temporarily unavailable (due to vacation, illness, out of town business, or other absence." *Id.* at Section X(D)(a)(c).

Finally, the 2015 Permit requires the discharger to evaluate the SWPPP on an annual basis and revise it as necessary to ensure compliance with the Storm Water Permit. 2015 Permit, Section X(A)-(B). Like the 1997 Permit, the 2015 Permit also requires that the discharger conduct an annual comprehensive site compliance evaluation that includes a review of all visual observation records, inspection reports and sampling and analysis results, a visual inspection of all potential pollutant sources for evidence of, or the potential for, pollutants entering the drainage system, a review and evaluation of all BMPs to determine whether the BMPs are adequate, properly implemented and maintained, or whether additional BMPs are needed, and a visual inspection of equipment needed to implement the SWPPP. 2015 Permit, Section X(B) and Section XV.

3. Allan Co. Has Violated and Continues to Violate the Storm Water Permit's SWPPP Requirements.

Information available to Waterkeeper indicates that Allan Co. has been and continues to conduct operations at the Facility with an inadequately developed and/or implemented SWPPP. The SWPPP fails to include an adequate assessment of potential pollutant sources or BMPs that achieve the BAT/BCT standards, as required by Section A(6) of the 1997 Permit and Sections X(G) and X(H) of the 2015 Permit. For example, while the SWPPP has a section titled "Pollutant Source Assessment/Potential Pollutant Sources", it does not assess the pollutant sources at the site or identify the pollutants that are likely associated with the identified sources. Moreover, the SWPPP does not identify all pollutants present at the Facility, or potential pollutants based on waste accepted at the Facility. Further, the SWPPP does not attempt to describe the approximate quantities of industrial materials handled at the Facility as required.

As a result of the inadequate pollutant source assessment described above, Allan Co. also fails to identify areas of the Facility where minimum BMPs required by the 2015 Permit are not adequate to prevent pollutants in discharges as required by Section X(G)(2)(b). Allan Co. also fails to identify additional parameters for analysis in discharges from the Facility that indicate the presence of pollutants in its discharges as required by Section X(G)(2)(d).

The failures described are representative of Allan Co.'s comprehensive failure to develop and implement, and revise as appropriate, a SWPPP that meets the requirements of Section A of the 1997 Permit and Section X of the 2015 Permit. Allan Co. has failed and continues to fail to adequately develop, implement, and/or revise a SWPPP, in violation of SWPPP requirements of the Storm Water Permit. Every day the Facility operates with an inadequately developed, implemented, and/or properly revised SWPPP is a separate and distinct violation of the Storm Water Permit and the Clean Water Act. Allan Co. has been in daily and continuous violation of the Storm Water Permit's SWPPP requirements since at least July 22, 2011. These violations are ongoing, and Waterkeeper will include additional violations when information becomes available. Allan Co. is subject to civil penalties for all violations of the Clean Water Act occurring since July 22, 2011.

D. Failure to Develop, Implement, and/or Revise an Adequate Monitoring and Reporting Program.

The Storm Water Permit requires permittees to develop and implement a storm water monitoring and reporting program ("M&RP") prior to conducting, and in order to continue, industrial activities. The specific M&RP requirements of the 1997 Permit and the 2015 Permit are set out below.

1. 1997 Permit Requirements.

Section B(1) and Provision E(3) of the 1997 Permit require facility operators to develop and implement an adequate M&RP by October 1, 1992, or prior to the commencement of industrial activities at a facility, that meets all of the requirements of the Storm Water Permit. The primary objective of the M&RP is to detect and measure the concentrations of pollutants in a facility's discharge to ensure compliance with the Storm Water Permit's Discharge Prohibitions, Effluent Limitations, and Receiving Water Limitations. *See* 1997 Permit, Section B(2).

The M&RP must therefore ensure that BMPs are effectively reducing and/or eliminating pollutants at the facility, and must be evaluated and revised whenever appropriate to ensure compliance with the Storm Water Permit. *Id.* Sections B(3) – B(16) of the 1997 Permit set forth the M&RP requirements. Specifically, Section B(3) requires dischargers to conduct quarterly visual observations of all drainage areas within their facility for the presence of authorized and unauthorized non-storm water discharges. Section B(4) requires dischargers to conduct visual observations of storm water discharges from one storm event per month during the Wet Season. Sections B(3) and B(4) further require dischargers to document the presence of any floating or suspended material, oil and grease, discolorations, turbidity, odor, and the source of any

pollutants. Dischargers must maintain records of observations, observation dates, locations observed, and responses taken to eliminate unauthorized non-storm water discharges and to reduce or prevent pollutants from contacting non-storm water and storm water discharges. *See* 1997 Permit, Sections B(3) and B(4). Dischargers must revise the SWPPP in response to these observations to ensure that BMPs are effectively reducing and/or eliminating pollutants at the facility. *Id.*, Section B(4). Sections B(5) and B(7) of the 1997 Permit require dischargers to visually observe and collect samples of storm water from all locations where storm water is discharged.

During its coverage under the 1997 Permit, the Facility was part of the Paper, Glass, Plastic Group Monitoring Program, and thus Allan Co. must comply with the group monitoring provisions set forth in Section B(15) of the 1997 Permit. Under Section B(15) of the 1997 Permit, the Facility Owners and/or Operators must collect at least two (2) samples from each discharge point at the Facility over a five (5) year period. *See* 1997 Permit, Sections B(5), B(7), and B(15). Storm water samples must be analyzed for TSS, pH, specific conductance ("SC"), total organic carbon or O&G, and other pollutants that are likely to be present in the facility's discharges in significant quantities. *See* Storm Water Permit, Section B(5)(c). The 1997 Permit requires facilities classified as SIC code 5093, such as the Facility, to also analyze storm water samples for iron, COD, aluminum, lead, copper and zinc. *Id.*; *see also* 1997 Permit, Table D, Sector N.

Section B(7)(d) of the 1997 Permit allows for the reduction of sampling locations in very limited circumstances when "industrial activities and BMPs within two or more drainage areas are substantially identical." If a discharger seeks to reduce sampling locations, the "[f]acility operators must document such a determination in the annual report." *Id.*

2. 2015 Permit Requirements.

As with the 1997 M&RP requirements, Sections X(I) and XI(A)-XI(D) of the 2015 Permit require facility operators to develop and implement an adequate M&RP that meets all of the requirements of the 2015 Permit. The objective of the M&RP is still to detect and measure the concentrations of pollutants in a facility's discharge, and to ensure compliance with the 2015 Permit's Discharge Prohibitions, Effluent Limitations, and Receiving Water Limitations. *See* 2015 Permit, Section XI. An adequate M&RP ensures that BMPs are effectively reducing and/or eliminating pollutants at the facility, and is evaluated and revised whenever appropriate to ensure compliance with the Storm Water Permit. *See id.*

An *increase* in observation frequency from the 1997 Permit, Section XI(A) of the 2015 Permit requires all visual observations at least once each month, and at the same time sampling occurs at a discharge location. Observations must document the presence of any floating and suspended material, O&G, discolorations, turbidity, odor and the source of any pollutants. 2015 Permit, Section XI(A)(2). Dischargers must document and maintain records of observations, observation dates, locations observed, and responses taken to reduce or prevent pollutants in storm water discharges. 2015 Permit, Section XI(A)(3).

Section XI(B)(1-5) of the 2015 Permit requires permittees to collect storm water discharge samples from a qualifying storm event[12] as follows: 1) from each discharge location, 2) from two storm events within the first half of each reporting year[13] (July 1 to December 31), 3) from two storm events within the second half of each reporting year (January 1 to June 30), and 4) within four hours of the start of a discharge, or the start of facility operations if the qualifying storm event occurs within the previous 12-hour period. Section XI(B)(11) of the 2015 Permit, among other requirements, provides that permittees must submit all sampling and analytical results for all samples via SMARTS within 30 days of obtaining results for each sampling event. Facilities that are in a Compliance Group, must make specific certifications on SMARTS (*see id.* at XIV), and must collect and analyze storm water samples from one (1) qualifying storm event within the first half of the reporting year, and one (1) qualifying storm event within the second half of the reporting year. *Id.* at XI(B)(3).

The parameters to be analyzed are also consistent with the 1997 Permit. Specifically, Section XI(B)(6)(a)-(b) of the 2015 Permit requires permitees to analyze samples for TSS, oil & grease, and pH. Section XI(B)(6)(c) of the 2015 Permit requires permitees to analyze samples for pollutants associated with all industrial operations, which for the Facility would include copper. Section XI(B)(6)(d) requires additional parameter analysis based on a facility's SIC code, which for the Facility includes, iron, lead, zinc, COD, and aluminum. *See* 2015 Permit, Table 1. Finally, Section XI(B)(6) of the 2015 Permit also requires dischargers to analyze storm water samples for additional applicable industrial parameters related to receiving waters with 303(d) listed impairments, or approved Total Maximum Daily Loads.

3. Allan Co. Has Violated and Continues to Violate the Storm Water Permit M&RP Requirements.

Allan Co. has been and continues to conduct operations at the Facility with an inadequately developed, implemented, and/or revised M&RP. For example, Allan Co. has failed and continues to fail to conduct all required quarterly and/or monthly visual observations as required. *See* 1997 Permit, Section B(3); *see also* 2015 Permit, Section XI(A)(1). Additionally, Allan Co. has failed to provide the records required by the Storm Water Permit for the visual observations in violation of Section B(4) of the 1997 Permit and Section XI(A)(3) of the 2015 Permit.

Allan Co. also fails to collect storm water samples as required by the Storm Water Permit. For example, for the past five (5) years Allan Co. has failed to collect storm water samples as required, in violation of the Storm Water Permit. Specifically, Allan Co. does not collect samples from required number of storm events, and/or from the first storm event of the year, or perform the sample collection within the required time frame. *See* 1997 Permit, Section

[12] The 2015 Permit defines a qualifying storm event as one that produces a discharge for at least one drainage area, and is preceded by 48-hours with no discharge from any drainage areas. 2015 Permit, Section XI(B)(1).
[13] A reporting year is defined as July 1 through June 30. 2015 Permit, Findings, ¶ 62(b).

B; 2015 Permit Section X(B).[14]

Allan Co. also fails to analyze samples for all parameters required by the Storm Water Permit. Specifically, Allan Co. must analyze samples for additional parameters identified in the Storm Water Permit based on its designated SIC code. *See* 1997 Permit, Table D; 2015 Permit, Table 1. Further, although the 2015 SWPPP identifies Santa Monica Bay as impaired for PCBs and for sediment toxicity, the SWPPP does not identify PCBs or pollutants that may contribute to the sediment toxicity parameters to be analyzed for as required by the 2015 Permit. *See* 2015 SWPPP, § 9.4.3; *see also* Fact Sheet, Section D(7). The 2015 SWPPPP also improperly lists "N/A" when identifying additional constituents based on a pollutant source assessment. *See id; see also* 2015 Permit, fact Sheet, Section J(3)(b)(iii) ("This General Permit requires Dischargers to control its discharge as necessary to meet the receiving water limitations, and to select additional monitoring parameters that are representative of industrial materials handled at the facility (regardless of the degree of storm water contact or relative mobility) that may be related to pollutants causing a water body to be impaired." Analyzing storm water samples for all pollutants associated with industrial activities is necessary to determine whether one or more BMPs implemented at the Facility is effective in reducing all pollutants in the discharge. *See* 2015 Permit, Section XI(B)(6)(c). Allan Co.'s sampling and monitoring program do not comply with these requirements, and thus violates the 1997 Permit and 2015 Permit.

Allan Co.'s failure to conduct sampling and monitoring as required by the Storm Water Permit demonstrates that it has failed to develop, implement, and/or revise an M&RP that complies with the requirements of Storm Water Permit. Every day that Allan Co. conducts operations in violation of the specific monitoring requirements of the Storm Water Permit, or with an inadequately developed and/or implemented M&RP, is a separate and distinct violation of the Storm Water Permit and the Clean Water Act. Allan Co. has been in daily and continuous violation of the Storm Water Permit's M&RP requirements every day since at least July 22, 2011. These violations are ongoing, and Waterkeeper will include additional violations when information becomes available. Allan Co. is subject to civil penalties for all violations of the Clean Water Act occurring since July 22, 2011.

E. Failure to Comply with the Storm Water Permit's Reporting Requirements.

Section B(14) of the 1997 Permit requires a permittee to submit an Annual Report to the Regional Board by July 1 of each year. Section B(14) requires that the Annual Report include a summary of visual observations and sampling results, an evaluation of the visual observation and sampling results, the laboratory reports of sample analysis, the annual comprehensive site

[14] In addition, the 2015 SWPPP is confusing and misleading regarding holding times for Allan Co. to deliver its storm water samples it has collected to the lab. For example, the SWPPP suggests that it is allowable to wait 180 days holding time for metal analysis of aluminum, zinc, lead, copper and iron. *See* 2015 SWPPP, § 9.4.4. Moreover, there is no procedure for how to preserve the samples that are kept for 180 days. *See id.* The permit does not allow for 180 day holding time, and instead requires samples be delivered to the lab within 48 hours.

compliance evaluation report, an explanation of why a permittee did not implement any activities required, and other information specified in Section B(13). The 2015 Permit includes the same annual reporting requirement. *See* 2015 Permit, Section XVI.

Allan Co. has failed and continues to fail to submit Annual Reports that comply with these reporting requirements. For example, in each Annual Report since the filing of the 2010-2011 Annual Report, Allan Co. certified that: (1) a complete Annual Comprehensive Site Compliance Evaluation was done pursuant to Section A(9) of the Storm Water Permit; (2) the SWPPP's BMPs address existing potential pollutant sources and additional BMPs are not needed; and (3) the SWPPP complies with the Storm Water Permit, or will otherwise be revised to achieve compliance. However, information available to Waterkeeper indicates that these certifications are erroneous. For example, pollutants were observed and, as discussed above, storm water samples collected from the Facility contain concentrations of pollutants above Benchmark Levels and WQS, thus demonstrating that the SWPPP's BMPs do not adequately address existing potential pollutant sources, yet the Annual Reports consistently report BMPs are adequate. And since the Facility's SWPPP does not include many elements required by the Storm Water Permit, it is erroneous to certify that the SWPPP complies with the Storm Water Permit.

In addition, the facility operator must report any noncompliance with the Storm Water Permit at the time that the Annual Report is submitted, including 1) a description of the noncompliance and its cause, 2) the period of noncompliance, 3) if the noncompliance has not been corrected, the anticipated time it is expected to continue, and 4) steps taken or planned to reduce and prevent recurrence of the noncompliance. Storm Water Permit, Section C(11)(d). Allan Co. has not reported non-compliance as required.

Information available to Waterkeeper indicates that Allan Co. has submitted incomplete and/or incorrect Annual Reports that fail to comply with the Storm Water Permit. As such, Allan Co. is in daily violation of the Storm Water Permit. Every day Allan Co. conducts operations at the Facility without reporting as required by the Storm Water Permit is a separate and distinct violation of the Storm Water Permit and Section 301(a) of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. §1311(a). Allan Co. has been in daily and continuous violation of the Storm Water Permit's reporting requirements every day since at least July 22, 2011. These violations are ongoing, the 2015 Permit's annual reporting requirements are as stringent as the 1997 Permit requirements, and Waterkeeper will include additional violations when information becomes available, including specifically violations of the 2015 Permit reporting requirements (*see* 2015 Permit, Sections XII. and XVI.). Allan Co. is subject to civil penalties for all violations of the Clean Water Act occurring since July 22, 2011.

IV. RELIEF SOUGHT FOR VIOLATIONS OF THE CLEAN WATER ACT

Pursuant to Section 309(d) of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1319(d), and the Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalties for Inflation, 40 C.F.R. § 19.4, each separate violation of the Clean Water Act subjects the violator to a penalty for all violations occurring during the period commencing five years prior to the date of the Notice Letter. These provisions of law

authorize civil penalties of up to $37,500.00 per day per violation for all Clean Water Act violations after January 12, 2009.

In addition to civil penalties, Waterkeeper will seek injunctive relief preventing further violations of the Clean Water Act pursuant to Sections 505(a) and (d), 33 U.S.C. § 1365(a) and (d), declaratory relief, and such other relief as permitted by law.

Last, pursuant to Section 505(d) of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1365(d), Waterkeeper will seek to recover its costs, including attorneys' and experts' fees, associated with this enforcement action.

V. CONCLUSION

Waterkeeper is willing to discuss effective remedies for the violations described in this Notice Letter. However, upon expiration of the 60-day notice period, Waterkeeper intends to file a citizen suit under Section 505(a) of the Clean Water Act for Allan Co's violations of the Storm Water Permit.

If you wish to pursue settlement discussions please contact Waterkeeper's legal counsel:

Drevet Hunt
Lawyers for Clean Water, Inc.
1004A O'Reilly Avenue
San Francisco, California 94129
Tel: (415) 440-6520

Sincerely,

Bruce Reznik
Executive Director
Los Angeles Waterkeeper

SERVICE LIST

VIA U.S. MAIL

Loretta Lynch, Attorney General
U.S. Attorney General
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Gina McCarthy
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
William Jefferson Clinton Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20460

Alexis Strauss
Regional Administrator
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region IX
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, California 94105

Thomas Howard
Executive Director
State Water Resources Control Board
P.O. Box 100
Sacramento, California 95812

Samuel Unger
Executive Officer II
Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board
320 West Fourth Street, Suite 200
Los Angeles, California 90013

Exhibit 1
Sample Results from Allan Co. Santa Monica Facility

Sample Location	Date/Time of Sample Collection	Parameter	Result	Units	Benchmark	Magnitude of Exceedance	CTR	Magnitude of Exceedance
2015/2016 Wet Season								
OUTFALL 1	1/5/16 0:00	Aluminum, Total	2	mg/L	0.75	**2.67**	none	
OUTFALL 1	1/5/16 0:00	Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD)	380	mg/L	120	**3.17**	none	
OUTFALL 1	1/5/16 0:00	Iron, Total	2.5	mg/L	1	**2.50**	none	
OUTFALL 1	1/5/16 0:00	Lead, Total	0.029	mg/L	0.069		0.21	
OUTFALL 1	1/5/16 0:00	Oil and Grease	4	mg/L	15		none	
OUTFALL 1	1/5/16 0:00	Zinc, Total	0.55	mg/L	0.11	**5.00**	0.09	**6.11**
OUTFALL 1	1/5/16 0:00	pH	7	SU	6.0-9.0		none	
OUTFALL 1	1/5/16 0:00	Copper	0.034	mg/L	0.0123	**2.76**	0.0048	**7.08**
OUTFALL 2	1/5/16 0:00	Aluminum, Total	0.87	mg/L	0.75	**1.16**	none	
OUTFALL 2	1/5/16 0:00	Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD)	110	mg/L	120		none	
OUTFALL 2	1/5/16 0:00	Iron, Total	1.3	mg/L	1	**1.30**	none	
OUTFALL 2	1/5/16 0:00	Lead, Total	0.017	mg/L	0.069		0.21	
OUTFALL 2	1/5/16 0:00	Oil and Grease	5.3	mg/L	15		none	
OUTFALL 2	1/5/16 0:00	Zinc, Total	0.43	mg/L	0.11	**3.91**	0.09	**4.78**
OUTFALL 2	1/5/16 0:00	pH	7	SU	6.0-9.0		none	
OUTFALL 2	1/5/16 0:00	copper	0.023	mg/L	0.0123	**1.87**	0.0048	**4.79**
OUTFALL 3	1/5/16 0:00	Aluminum, Total	0.68	mg/L	0.75		none	
OUTFALL 3	1/5/16 0:00	Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD)	86	mg/L	120		none	
OUTFALL 3	1/5/16 0:00	Iron, Total	1.1	mg/L	1	**1.10**	none	
OUTFALL 3	1/5/16 0:00	Lead, Total	0.024	mg/L	0.069		0.21	
OUTFALL 3	1/5/16 0:00	Oil and Grease	3.1	mg/L	15		none	

Exhibit 1
Sample Results from Allan Co. Santa Monica Facility

Sample Location	Date/Time of Sample Collection	Parameter	Result	Units	Benchmark	Magnitude of Exceedance	CTR	Magnitude of Exceedance
OUTFALL 3	1/5/16 0:00	Zinc, Total	0.3	mg/L	0.11	**2.73**	0.09	**3.33**
OUTFALL 3	1/5/16 0:00	pH	7	SU	6.0-9.0		none	
OUTFALL 3	1/5/16 0:00	copper	0.029	mg/L	0.0123	**2.36**	0.0048	**6.04**
OUTFALL 4	1/5/16 0:00	Aluminum, Total	0.35	mg/L	0.75		none	
OUTFALL 4	1/5/16 0:00	Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD)	130	mg/L	120	**1.08**	none	
OUTFALL 4	1/5/16 0:00	Iron, Total	1.6	mg/L	1	**1.60**	none	
OUTFALL 4	1/5/16 0:00	Lead, Total	0.0065	mg/L	0.069		0.21	
OUTFALL 4	1/5/16 0:00	Oil and Grease	ND	mg/L	15		none	
OUTFALL 4	1/5/16 0:00	Zinc, Total	0.18	mg/L	0.11	**1.64**	0.09	**2.00**
OUTFALL 4	1/5/16 0:00	pH	7	SU	6.0-9.0		none	
OUTFALL 4	1/5/16 0:00	copper	0.051	mg/L	0.0123	**4.15**	0.0048	**10.63**
2014/2015 Wet Season								
outfall 1	12/2/14	oil grease	ND	mg/L	15			
outfall 1	12/2/14	aluminum	0.24	mg/L	0.75			
outfall 1	12/2/14	SC	24.2	u/homs	200			
outfall 1	12/2/14	TSS	17	mg/L	100			
outfall 1	12/2/14	pH	5.96	SU	6.0-9.0			
outfall 1	12/2/14	COD	ND	mg/L	120			
outfall 2	12/2/14	oil grease	ND	mg/L	15			
outfall 2	12/2/14	aluminum	0.34	mg/L	0.75			
outfall 2	12/2/14	SC	24.5	mg/L	200			
outfall 2	12/2/14	TSS	21	mg/L	100			
outfall 2	12/2/14	pH	5.98	SU	6.0-9.0			
outfall 2	12/2/14	COD	16	mg/L	120			

Exhibit 1
Sample Results from Allan Co. Santa Monica Facility

Sample Location	Date/Time of Sample Collection	Parameter	Result	Units	Benchmark	Magnitude of Exceedance	CTR	Magnitude of Exceedance
outfall 3	12/2/14	oil grease	ND	mg/L	15			
outfall 3	12/2/14	aluminum	0.24	mg/L	0.75			
outfall 3	12/2/14	SC	14.2	mg/L	200			
outfall 3	12/2/14	TSS	18	mg/L	100			
outfall 3	12/2/14	pH	6.03	SU	6.0-9.0			
outfall 3	12/2/14	COD	ND	mg/L	120			
outfall 4	12/2/14	oil grease	ND	mg/L	15			
outfall 4	12/2/14	aluminum	0.38	mg/L	0.75			
outfall 4	12/2/14	SC	25.5	mg/L	200			
outfall 4	12/2/14	TSS	28	mg/L	100			
outfall 4	12/2/14	pH	6.17	SU	6.0-9.0			
outfall 4	12/2/14	COD	ND	mg/L	120			
2013/2014 Wet Season								
NO SAMPLES COLLECTED-DESIGNATED TO SAMPLE FOR GROUP PLAN BUT CLAIM NO QUALIFYING EVENT								
2012/2013 Wet Season								
NO SAMPLES COLLECTED-IN GROUP PLAN								
2011/2012 Wet Season								
NO SAMPLES COLLECTED-IN GROUP PLAN								

Exhibit 2

Dates of > 0.1 inches of Precipitation
Allan Co. - Santa Monica

Date	Precipitation
11/18/12	0.26
11/29/12	0.25
11/30/12	0.47
12/3/12	0.28
12/18/12	0.51
12/24/12	0.5
12/26/12	0.35
12/29/12	0.45
1/24/13	0.82
1/25/13	0.13
2/20/13	0.18
3/8/13	0.51
5/6/13	0.72
11/21/13	0.34
11/29/13	0.23
12/19/13	0.11
2/3/14	0.14
2/27/14	0.81
2/28/14	2.28
3/1/14	0.75
3/2/14	0.43
4/2/14	0.2
11/1/14	0.43
12/1/14	0.28
12/2/14	1.02
12/3/14	0.33
12/4/14	0.17
12/12/14	1.58
12/16/14	0.32
12/17/14	0.25
12/31/14	0.12
1/11/15	0.94
2/23/15	0.61
3/1/15	0.11
3/2/15	0.8
4/8/15	0.13
5/8/15	0.21
5/14/15	0.16
5/15/15	0.56

Exhibit 2

Dates of > 0.1 inches of Precipitation
Allan Co. - Santa Monica

Date	Precipitation
7/18/15	0.25
9/15/15	2.39
10/6/15	0.36
12/14/15	0.16
12/20/15	0.26
1/5/16	1.41
1/6/16	0.63
1/7/16	0.32
1/31/16	0.43
2/18/16	0.67
3/6/16	0.65
3/7/16	0.38
3/11/16	0.45
4/8/16	0.15